UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/940,200	08/27/2001	Shell S. Simpson	10008257-1	4913

7590   05/19/2006

HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY
Intellectual Property Administration
P.O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER
SALL, EL HADJI MALICK

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2157	

DATE MAILED: 05/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action **Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**	Application No. 09/940,200	Applicant(s) SIMPSON ET AL.
	Examiner El Hadji M. Sall	Art Unit 2157

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED <u>14 April 2006</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

   a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.

   b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

      Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

<u>NOTICE OF APPEAL</u>

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

<u>AMENDMENTS</u>

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because

   (a)☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);

   (b)☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);

   (c)☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or

   (d)☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

     NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

   The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

   Claim(s) allowed: _____.

   Claim(s) objected to: _____.

   Claim(s) rejected: _____.

   Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

<u>AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE</u>

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

<u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u>

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
   <u>See Continuation Sheet.</u>

12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____

13. ☐ Other: _____.

MOUSTAFA M. MEKY
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The same arguments were presented in the previous communication. Explaination has been given in the final Office action.

(A)   As to claims 22, 32 and 42, Applicant argues that Goshey does not teach "discovering devices directly connected to a network that are not directly connected to a computer"
In regards to point (A), examiner respectfully disagrees. ·
Column 5, lines 8-24, Goshey discloses users of a selected networked computer will then be able to access the peripheral devices connected to other network computers as if the peripheral devices were connected to their local computer (i.e. in figure 2C, the peripheral devices 118, 120 and 121 are connected to computer 112b through adapter 116b, where computer 112d can access them to their network). In figure 2C, it is clear that computer peripheral devices 118, 120 and 121 directly connected to the network where 112b belongs to the above side of the network, and computer 112d belonging to the below side of the network "is not directly connected" to peripheral devices 118, 120 and 121. In addition, the host adapters between either computer 112b or 112d could be routers, modems, access servers or something similar serving as host adapters to communicate with the peripheral devices in local or remote locations. In this case, the peripheral devices are "connected to the network", but are "not directly connected" to either computers.

(B)   Applicant argues that Goshey does not teach explicit limitations of Applicant's claims In that Carcerano does not remedy the deficiencies of the Goshey reference.
In regards to point (B), examiner respectfully disagrees.
As to claim 39, Goshey fails to teach explicitly logic configured to receive a set of universal resource locators (URLs) that identifies the locations of devices discovered by the device discovery service.
However, Carcerano teaches logic configured to receive a set of universal resource locators (URLs) that identifies the locations of devices discovered by the device discovery service (column 7, lines 32-37, Carcerano discloses the browser sends a URL-encoded request to the server. The URL request identifies the domain name of the server as well as the location of the file resource on the server).
It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Goshey in view of Carcerano to provide logic configured to receive a set of universal resource locators (URLs) that identifies the locations of devices discovered by the device discovery service, the devices not directly connected to a computer. One would be motivated to do so to allow defining a route to a file on an HTTP server.
Carcerano has remedied the deficiencies of Goshey. Carcerano provides universal resource locators (URL), which is used in combination of Goshey to provide identifying the locations of devices discovered by the device discovery service, the devices not directly connected to a computer.